

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 6 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guilford et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0087674) in view of Trompower et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,019). Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guilford et al. in view of DeBeer (U.S. Pub. 2005/0101323) and further in view of Trompower. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guilford et al. in view of Trompower and further in view of DeBeer.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the claim is rendered obvious over Guilford in view of Trompower. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, the present invention teaches using a roaming PLMN table when international roaming occurs, while Guilford recites that a table is a routing table having only a preferred roaming partner, which is used for a specific service. Hence, Guilford merely recites obtaining a communication link that can provide the specific service by using the table. Guilford does not suggest the structure relating to the international roaming of the present invention. Accordingly, Guilford neither teaches nor reasonably suggest being able to perform the international roaming, as taught by the present invention.

Furthermore, in the present invention, when the international roaming occurs, there is provided: determining whether a mobile station can roam by using obtained PLMN information before performing a registration procedure. Contrary to the present invention, Guilford teaches detecting the strongest signal for a primary service and attempting registration by referring to the table.

Specifically, the claims of the present invention recite obtaining PLMN information by using a frequency having a maximum receiving strength, and then, using the roaming PLMN table when the international roaming occurs, whereas in par. [0068], Guilford simply recites, by using the routing table, detecting a preferred roaming provider having the strongest signal in the table.

Moreover, according to the present invention, when international roaming occurs, the obtained PLMN determines whether the roaming table exists. However, when attempting to first register (referring to par. [0058]), or when the current provider cannot support the requested service as shown in step 84 of Fig 7A, Guilford only teaches using the stored table again.

Second, Guilford et al. discloses intelligent network selection based on quality of service and application over different wireless networks. The Examiner cites paragraphs 0053-0055; 0066-0069; Figs. 2-4; and 7A in order to support the rejection. Figs. 2-3 and 5-7 are silent about roaming, while Fig. 4 discloses preferred roaming. Although Guilford does disclose preferred roaming, Claim 1 recites a different feature, specifically, “when international roaming occurs.” The teaching of international roaming is nowhere to be found in the cited passages or elsewhere in Guilford.

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that Guilford fails to disclose, “roaming time is reduced by selectively registering a Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) location only in a base station with a roaming function.” The Examiner cites Trompower at col. 17, lines 37-53 for curing Guilford’s deficiencies. Trompower discloses “unlike the roaming tables in each base station, however, the reduced roaming table does not include an entry for every base station in the system. Rather, the reduced roaming table only includes entries for those base stations which are predetermined likely to be new base stations with which the mobile terminal may register.” In contrast, the present invention registers a Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) location in any and every base station as long as the base station is equipped with a roaming function. Trompower embarks on this deterministic analysis to determine if the mobile terminal may register with this particular base station. There is no teaching in Trompower remotely related to the recitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to show that all of the recitations of Claim 1 are taught in or suggested by the prior art. The

Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 6 of the present application recites, in part, “ roaming time is reduced by selectively registering a Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) location only in a base station with a roaming function.”

The Examiner acknowledges that Guilford fails to disclose said limitation. Trompower does not cure this defect. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to show that all of the recitations of Claim 6 are taught in or suggested by the prior art. The Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-9, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475
PJF/EC